



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/128,753	08/04/1998	DONALD V. LIGHTCAP, JR.	DVL-003PAT	3373

7590 08/13/2003

MARK F. SMITH
SBTECHNOLOGY LAW
7577 CENTRAL PARK BLVD
SUITE 102
MASON, OH 45040

EXAMINER

PRYOR, ALTON NATHANIEL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1616

DATE MAILED: 08/13/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/128,753

Applicant(s)

LIGHTCAP, ET AL.

Examiner

Alton N. Pryor

Art Unit

1616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13, 15-17, 25-27, 29, 30, 32, 33, 35-43, 46 and 47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-13, 15-17, 42 and 43 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 25-27, 29, 30, 32, 33, 35-41, 46 and 47 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: |

DETAILED ACTION

The finality of the office action dated 1/29/03 has been withdrawn. New rejections are made on claims. See rejections below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

1. Claims 25-27,29,30,32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for pesticides, foam stabilizers foam thickeners, and plant growth regulators specifically disclosed in specification, does not reasonably provide enablement for other pesticides, stabilizers, thickeners and growth regulators. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make / use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The asserted utility is not believable on its face. The predictability or lack thereof in the art refers to the ability of one skilled in the art to extrapolate the disclosed or known results to the claimed invention. The lower the predictability, the higher the direction and guidance that must be provided by the applicant. In the instant invention the predictability is very low and consequently, the need for the higher levels of direction and guidance by the applicant. However, the

Art Unit: 1616

amount of direction and guidance provided by the applicant is limited to treatment.

There is no evidence in the specification that established correlation between the experiment and the claimed utility. The quantity of experimentation required to use the composition as claimed in the instant invention, based on applicant's disclosure would be undue because, one of ordinary skill in the art would have performed significant amount of experiments.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 33,36-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the method wherein the vegetable oil, emulsifier, foaming agent, foam stabilizer, growth regulator, and pesticide are specifically according to specification, does not reasonably provide enablement for a method comprising all other vegetable oils, emulsifiers, foaming agents, foam stabilizers, growth regulators and pesticides. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make / use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The asserted utility is not believable on its face. The predictability or lack thereof in the art refers to the ability of one skilled in the art to extrapolate the disclosed or known results to the claimed

Art Unit: 1616

invention. The lower the predictability, the higher the direction and guidance that must be provided by the applicant. In the instant invention the predictability is very low and consequently, the need for the higher levels of direction and guidance by the applicant. However, the amount of direction and guidance provided by the applicant is limited to treatment. There is no evidence in the specification that established correlation between the experiment and the claimed utility. The quantity of experimentation required to use the method as claimed in the instant invention, based on applicant's disclosure would be undue because, one of ordinary skill in the art would have performed significant amount of experiments.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 25-27,29,30,32,35,46 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The Markusk group of emusifiers is unclear. What is meant by – akyl, aryl, glycol ethoxylate, proxylate, butoxylate or sulfonate based emulsifiers? Please point Examiner to support in the specification once corrected.

Claim 47 recites the limitation "the emulsion" in 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 1616

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by JP


61204105; 9/10/86. JP teaches a composition comprising cotton seed oil, polyoxyethylenealkylether (alkyl glycol ethoxylate), alkyl sulfonate (foaming agent) and a fungicide (pesticide). See abstract.

Telephonic Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alton N. Pryor whose telephone number is 703 308-4691. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 a.m. - 4:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jose Dees can be reached on 703 308-4628. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703 305-3592 for regular communications and 703-305-3592 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 308-1235.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Alton N. Pryor', is written over a horizontal line.

Alton Pryor, AU 1616
August 9, 2003